



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

offended Domitian? No doubt there was no love lost between the brothers, but if Domitian could enrol Titus among the gods, he could surely share with him a poet's little meed of earthly praise. Probably he did not take Martial so seriously as the modern philologist does. Thus he was supersensitive about his baldness, but our poet could poke limitless fun at those similarly afflicted with impunity. (Suet. *Dom.* 18). How does it help matters anyway to make *uterque* mean Titus and Vespasian, the latter being by no means a *rerum certa salus* and *terrarum gloria* (cf. this very language used of Domitian v. 1. 7-8) in Domitian's estimation? Moreover, Titus is still included, and if even in 94 A.D. everybody would at once interpret the *uterque* of him and his father, surely the expression was not so *rätselhaft* as to beguile a Domitian.

The reviewer has pointed out as fairly as a brief review permits what seem to him to be weaknesses in Dr. Lieben's long chain of argument, but only a perusal of the articles themselves will enable the student of Martial to judge how illuminating and interesting they are.

WALTON BROOKS McDANIEL

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

M. Manilii Astronomicon Liber Secundus. Recensuit et enarrauit
A. E. HOUSMAN. London: Grant Richards, 1912. 4s. 6d. net.

The biographer of the late Walter Headlam says of him, "His appreciation of other people's humour, in life or books, was inexhaustible. Perhaps no modern writing of the kind gave him keener delight than Professor Housman's Introductions to Manilius and Juvenal. Often would he read or quote to his friends certain classical sentences therefrom, and confess, with streaming eyes, that he loved above all things to be made to laugh outright." Doubtless Mr. Headlam's withers were unwrung, and he could laugh with unembarrassed gaiety. But some others must have winced. Perhaps to those who have the pleasure of Mr. Housman's personal acquaintance the unrestrained causticity of his famous Introductions was merely the indulgence of a merry humor. They were indubitably lively reading, but to the uninitiated their pungency was too much like that of a Mexican tamale: it overwhelmed and disguised the flavor of the solid sense and wise learning which lay beneath.

The reader who expects to find in this edition of Book II of Manilius another prefatory dose of spluttering coruscations will be disappointed. The mood has spent itself, or the physician of intellects judged that a sufficient bolus had already been administered, or perhaps an added decade of years and academic preferment have wrought a pacifying influence. Still the Latin commentary is not without spice.

Certain things in the equipment of Mr. Housman's edition of Manilius I, published in 1903, might be taken to indicate that he had no intention of

proceeding farther with the formal editing of the text. Perhaps it was for this reason that Mr. Garrod selected as his specimen, published in 1911, the second book, though his Introductions might well have been prefixed to an edition of the first book, or of the whole work. Mr. Housman has now apparently thought better of his task, and parallels Mr. Garrod's work a year later by his own. Nor is the duplication of precise field to be deprecated. The text of Manilius is in an unusually difficult state, and even when two editors are no farther apart than Messrs. Housman and Garrod in their judgment of the individual MSS, their reconstitutions of its form are still likely to differ widely—as these indeed do—while for the elucidation of the subject-matter by more than even one or two learned commentators the ordinary student of Manilius may well be profoundly grateful.

Mr. Housman's Introduction to Book II is exceedingly valuable and helpful, being a running "exposition [in English] of its astrological contents, together with most of the parallels to be adduced from other astrologers." This is much more effective than the parallel translation employed by Mr. Garrod. The full commentary is arranged conveniently under the text, as in the edition of Book I, and, also as in the earlier volume, is in Latin—probably because Mr. Housman hopes to make it intelligible to other than English-speaking readers. It is certainly too often the case still that continental scholars appear to fight shy of writings shrouded in the obscurity of the English language. Everywhere in the commentary, as in that on Book I, the thoroughness of Mr. Housman's acquaintance with Manilius and with ancient astrological concepts in general is quite evident.

Mr. Garrod judges that cod. Manilianus G "is in itself an inferior L; but it is an inferior L which has been worked through (or its parent had, more probably) by a fool with a better MS of Manilius than the world will ever see again—till Herculeum gives up its dead." His *stemma codicum* is somewhat complex, as he desires to indicate also the precise dependence of many MSS other than the three (GLM) which he regards as alone possessing independent value. For Mr. Housman the MSS problem is much simpler: the two chief families of MSS are equally good, for sometimes one excels, and sometimes the other ("Let us hear no talk of 'the better family of MSS,' for nothing of that name exists": ed. Book I, p. xxiv). In either family sometimes one MS has the better reading, sometimes the other. Readings are to be judged intrinsically, at any rate not at all from the family or MS in which they occur. There is of course much truth in certain of Mr. Housman's particular critical enunciations, but this general position has not appeared to convince the prudent, in spite of the contemptuous vigor with which he asserted and carried it out in the case of Book I (cf. *op. cit.*, p. xxxi ff.). At the present time Mr. Housman's *stemma* is not merely simpler than Mr. Garrod's; it is simpler than when he published the first book; for he has meanwhile become convinced that V (Vossianus 390), as well as Urbinates 667 and 668, is in direct descent from M (Matritensis M 31), and may

therefore be disregarded. His new *stemma* accordingly includes only GLL²M, and shows no such troublesome serpentine lines of intertwining as Mr. Garrod's.

Mr. Housman has made one step in advance since 1903, even though it has not carried him very far. At that time he was apparently quite content to depend for his knowledge of the actual readings of the MSS upon the published collations or excerpts made by others, even when he had little respect for their judgment otherwise. As late as 1907 he expended considerable ingenuity in establishing (*Class. Quar.*, I, 290-98), by a comparison of the excerpts from M printed by Robinson Ellis (*Class. Rev.*, VII, VIII) with an unpublished collation of M by Gustav Loewe (cod. MS philol. 139 in the library of the University of Göttingen) and with readings of RUV, the grave probability that a number of the striking readings ascribed to M by Professor Ellis must be mere errors of the excerptor, and did not stand in the way of the belief that RUV are all descendants of M. Mr. Housman has now actually obtained photographs of M and L, and has gone so far in the case of G as at least to compare the readings of Thomas (1888) with those of Bechert (1900), and to secure the judgment of the curator of MSS at Brussels where they disagree. In the case of M the photographs apparently confirm the acute inferences he drew in 1907 about certain of the excerpts published by Mr. Ellis. The experience might well indicate to a text-editor the advisability of autopsy, even at a considerable expense of time, trouble, and money. Happy the editor who needs for the support of his judgment no more immediate and precise witness than photographs can supply! When will the harder lesson be generally learned, of the necessity of collations personally made and reviewed with painstaking accuracy, and with the comparison in presence of the MSS of any collations previously made by others—all this, and in addition, not at all in substitution, the possession of photographs, where that is possible? Even then error may arise between the collation and the printed *apparatus criticus*. It is quite possible to see that Mr. Ellis' observation and recorded note in the case of several of the variants referred to above may not have been at fault, but that the blunders appeared in the process of the later transcription and arrangement for printing. There is one satisfaction: if Mr. Housman had himself collated M, or obtained his photographs of it before 1907, we should have been deprived of the enjoyment of the admirable specimen of reasoning afforded in his article of that year.

E. T. M.

A Commentary on Herodotus with Introduction and Appendixes.

By W. W. How and J. WELLS. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912. Pp. 446, 423. 7s. 6d. each.

This book "is intended principally for the use of undergraduates," but the university teacher also will find it a convenient and reliable book of